

SHAKESPEARE SURVEY

AN ANNUAL SURVEY OF
SHAKESPEARIAN STUDY & PRODUCTION

IO

EDITED BY
ALLARDYCE NICOLL

Issued under the Sponsorship of

THE UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM
THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER
THE SHAKESPEARE MEMORIAL THEATRE
THE SHAKESPEARE BIRTHPLACE TRUST



CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1957

PUBLISHED BY
THE SYNDICS OF THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Bentley House, 200 Euston Road, London, N.W. 1
American Branch: 32 East 57th Street, New York 22, N.Y.

*Printed in Great Britain at the University Press, Cambridge
(Brooke Crutchley, University Printer)*

CONTENTS

[Notes are placed at the end of each contribution. All line references are to the 'Globe' edition, and, unless for special reasons, quotations are from this text]

<i>List of Plates</i>	page viii
Shakespeare's Roman Plays: 1900-1956 by J. C. MAXWELL	I
Shakespeare's 'small Latin'—how much? by J. DOVER WILSON	12
Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Romans by TERENCE SPENCER	27
The Metamorphosis of Violence in <i>Titus Andronicus</i> by EUGENE M. WAITH	39
From Plutarch to Shakespeare: a Study of <i>Coriolanus</i> by HERMANN HEUER	50
The Composition of <i>Titus Andronicus</i> by R. F. HILL	60
Classical Costume in Shakespearian Productions by W. M. MERCHANT	71
Shakespeare's Use of a Gallery over the Stage by RICHARD HOSLEY	77
Lear's Questions by WINIFRED M. T. NOWOTNY	90
'Egregiously an Ass': The Dark Side of the Moor. A view of Othello's Mind by ALBERT GERARD	98
Shakespeare in Schools by J. H. WALTER	107
Shakespeare Festival, Toronto, Canada by EARLE GREY	111
<i>International Notes</i>	115
<i>Shakespeare productions in the United Kingdom: 1955</i>	123
Drams of Eale, A Review of Recent Productions by RICHARD DAVID	126
The Year's Contributions to Shakespearian Study	
1. Critical Studies reviewed by KENNETH MUIR	135
2. Shakespeare's Life, Times and Stage reviewed by R. A. FOAKES	143
3. Textual Studies reviewed by JAMES G. MCMANAWAY	151
<i>Books Received</i>	159
<i>Index</i>	161

LIST OF PLATES

PLS I-IV ARE BETWEEN PP. 72 AND 73

I-III. Classical Costumes in Shakespearian Productions

- IV. *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, Trinity College, Toronto, 1955. The Earle Grey Shakespeare Company

PLS V-VIII ARE BETWEEN PP. 128 AND 129

- V. A. *Titus Andronicus*, Shakespeare Memorial Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon, 1955. Produced and designed by Peter Brook. Titus cheated of his hand (Angus McBean)
- B. *Troilus and Cressida*, Old Vic Theatre, 1956. Produced by Tyrone Guthrie, designed by Frederick Crooke. Greek G.H.Q. (Houston Rogers)
- VI. A. *Titus Andronicus*. The Hero.
- B. *Othello*, Shakespeare Memorial Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon, 1956. Produced by Glen Byam Shaw, designed by Motley. Iago and the Moor (Angus McBean)
- VII. A. *Troilus and Cressida*. In the Paddock (Houston Rogers)
- B. *Troilus and Cressida*. In the Conservatory (Houston Rogers)
- VIII. A. *Hamlet*, Phoenix Theatre, 1955. Produced by Peter Brook, designed by Georges Wakhevitch. Laertes, Claudius, Hamlet, Gertrude, Horatio (Angus McBean)
- B. *Hamlet*, Shakespeare Memorial Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon, 1956. Produced by Michael Langham, designed by Michael Northen, costumes by Desmond Heeley. The Bread-board (Angus McBean)

SHAKESPEARE'S ROMAN PLAYS: 1900-1956

BY

J. C. MAXWELL

The Stratford International Shakespeare Conference of 1955, which was centred on the Roman Plays, not only furnished a happy example of critical co-operation, but showed how deeply these plays engage the interest of present-day Shakespearians. It is evident that the concern of critics has, over the past half-century, tended to concentrate on a rather later period of Shakespeare's career than had previously been customary, and it is not entirely a result of the chronological basis of arrangement that the plays linked with *King Lear* by L. C. Knights under the title '*King Lear and the Great Tragedies*' in the Pelican *Age of Shakespeare* (1955) are not the other three of Bradley's 'great four', but *Macbeth*, *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Coriolanus*.

The early years of the century saw a number of substantial studies along later-nineteenth-century lines, culminating in M. W. MacCallum's *Shakespeare's Roman Plays* (1910). After a less fruitful interlude, a second notable period begins with the publication of Harley Granville-Barker's first series of *Prefaces* (1927), soon followed by G. Wilson Knight's *The Wheel of Fire* (1930). It is not yet possible to distinguish any more recent date of cardinal importance, but perhaps the last few years have seen a heightened concern for an eclectic approach to the plays, with a certain bias towards stressing, in L. C. Knights' phrase, Shakespeare's "political wisdom".

This attitude towards the plays involves recognition of their affinities with the history plays, but it has not meant treating them as necessarily prevented by those affinities from being fully tragic. The present-day approach thus differs from that of A. C. Bradley, who, in excluding them, along with *Richard II* and *Richard III*, from *Shakespearean Tragedy* as "tragic histories or historical tragedies", conjectured that Shakespeare would have met criticism of their sometimes "undramatic material... by appealing to their historical character, and by denying that such works are to be judged by the standard of pure tragedy" (p. 3).

I propose to survey the main critical work of the century under the three periods noted above, but there are certain more technical subjects—Canon, Text and Chronology, and Sources—that are more conveniently dealt with separately and without subdivisions, and there is one other play that calls for some comment before the 'Roman Plays', as commonly understood, are examined at all.

TITUS ANDRONICUS

The three Plutarch plays are obviously very different from the early work that was, none the less, described on the title-page of the 1594 Quarto as *The Most Lamentable Romaine Tragedie of Titus Andronicus*. The context in which this play could seem much less un-Roman than it does to us has been admirably studied by Terence Spencer in this volume.

At the beginning of the century, British (though not German) scholars were generally inclined to reject Shakespeare's authorship. An exception was H. Bellyse Baildon, the Arden editor (1904), whose arguments for its authenticity are sometimes of a curious kind—that scepticism about Shakespeare's authorship "is part of that general sceptical movement or wave

SHAKESPEARE SURVEY

which has landed us first in the so-called 'Higher Criticism' in matters of Religion, and finally in Agnosticism itself". Baildon must have felt confirmed in his views when that veteran agnostic and disintegrator J. M. Robertson published in 1905 *Did Shakespeare Write 'Titus Andronicus'?* (revised in 1924 as *An Introduction to the Study of the Shakespeare Canon*), his answer being a resounding "No". Most of the work done in this period was concerned with questions of authenticity and sources, and complicated theories involving the lost *Titus and Vespasian* and surviving Dutch and German seventeenth-century versions were evolved by such scholars as H. De W. Fuller and G. P. Baker (both in *PMLA*, xvi, 1901), belatedly echoed by John Munro, *Times Literary Supplement*, 10 June 1949, while more remote Byzantine sources were later explored by W. Dibelius (*Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, XLVIII, 1912), and F. Granger, *Times Literary Supplement*, 1 April 1920. More recently, the 'Roman Background' in Seneca and Ovid has been examined by R. A. Law (*Studies in Philology*, XL, 1943), who suggests that the author also made use of some of Plutarch's Lives. The rediscovered eighteenth-century chapbook now in the Folger Library has come to be regarded as probably representing, in substance, the play's sole immediate narrative source. It is fully analysed by R. M. Sargent (*Studies in Philology*, XLIV, 1949). A tendency to belief in composite authorship of the play, and to giving Shakespeare a fairly large share in it as a reviser, is represented by T. M. Parrott (*Modern Language Review*, xiv, 1919), who saw Peele's as the other hand. He was followed and elaborated by A. K. Gray (*Studies in Philology*, xxv, 1928), and by J. S. G. Bolton (*Studies in Philology*, xxx, 1933). A still more elaborate form of the same view was argued by J. Dover Wilson in his edition of 1948. The present writer, in the new Arden edition of 1953, while sceptical about revision or divided authorship in the rest of the play, tentatively accepted the first Act and the opening soliloquy of the second as Peele's work—a view which he had attempted to support by statistical evidence about a syntactical peculiarity in an earlier article (*Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, XLIX, 1950). Scepticism about Peele's hand on grounds alike of language and structure has been expressed by A. M. Sampley in *Studies in Philology*, xxx (1933), and in *PMLA*, LI (1936); and a solely Shakespearian authorship has been ably defended by H. T. Price (*Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, XLII, 1943), who has also made a valuable contribution to the study of the play's language in *Papers of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts and Letters*, XXI (1936 for 1935).

Titus is the only play of which the present century has produced a complete copy of a quarto earlier than any hitherto known. The unique copy of the 1594 quarto discovered in Sweden in 1904 was collated by W. Keller (*Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, xli, 1905), but close study of it had to wait for the publication of a facsimile, edited by J. Q. Adams, in 1936, though earlier studies of value were made by J. S. G. Bolton (*PMLA*, XLIV, 1929), and R. B. McKerrow (*Library*, xv, 1934-5). H. T. Price contributed a study, largely concerned with spelling, to *English Institute Essays 1947* (1948).

The play's date is intimately involved with other problems, such as authorship and early theatrical history, and scholars are still divided between dates as far apart as 1589 and 1594. P. E. Bennett (*Notes and Queries*, n.s. II, 1955) gives good reason for dismissing the often-quoted passage from *A Knack to Know a Knave* as evidence for the existence of *Titus* in 1592.

More general literary criticism of *Titus* has tended to be buried among the scholarly speculations which have been surveyed. Apart from a general study by W. Keller (*Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, LXXIX, 1938), little of moment was published before Howard Baker's *Induction to Tragedy* (1939),

SHAKESPEARE'S ROMAN PLAYS: 1900-1956

which related the play to *A Mirror for Magistrates* and to *The Spanish Tragedy*, and minimized Senecan affiliations. Useful emphasis on its formal, even academic, qualities was provided by M. C. Bradbrook, *Shakespeare and Elizabethan Poetry* (1951), expanding briefer comments in her *Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy* (1935), and by E. M. W. Tillyard, *Shakespeare's History Plays* (1944), who notes the political interests which link *Titus* with the Histories. Dover Wilson's view, developing suggestions in Mark Van Doren's *Shakespeare* (1939), that the more extravagant portions were written by Shakespeare with a burlesque intention, has not found much support. Perhaps more significant than any written criticism the play has provoked in recent years is the Stratford production of 1955, which left those who saw it sharply divided on its artistic value, but amply demonstrated its theatrical potentialities even for a present-day audience.

CANON, TEXT AND CHRONOLOGY

There has been no revolutionary change in the generally accepted account of the three Plutarch plays under any of these three heads. Only the most hardened disintegrators have raised serious doubts about authorship, chiefly in connexion with *Julius Caesar*, where J. M. Robertson, *The Shakespeare Canon*, I (1922), and W. Wells, *The Authorship of 'Julius Caesar'* (1923), claimed to detect the hands of Marlowe, Jonson and Beaumont.

For all three plays the Folio is the only authority, and the prevailing view, expressed, for example, by Sir Walter Greg in *The Shakespeare First Folio: Its Bibliographical and Textual History* (1955), has been that *Julius Caesar* was printed from a transcript, probably of the prompt-book, and *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Coriolanus* from author's "foul papers carefully prepared for production". The tendency to believe too readily in foul papers as copy has been challenged by Fredson Bowers, *On Editing Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Dramatists* (1955), who suggests that the intervention of a transcript is probable for these two plays.

Textual derangement has been suggested both in *Julius Caesar* and in *Antony and Cleopatra*. In *Julius Caesar*, the double announcement of Portia's death continues to divide critics, some crediting it to Shakespeare's intention (most recently G. Baldini in *Nuova Antologia*, CDLIII, 1951, and W. D. Smith in *Shakespeare Quarterly*, IV, 1953), others believing in a double recension, with both versions preserved in the Folio text. Originally suggested by Resch in 1882, this view has been accepted in the present century by most editors—Macmillan, Furness, Kittredge, Dover Wilson, Sisson and Dorsch—and also by Chambers and Granville-Barker. It was elaborated by P. Kannengiesser (*Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, XLIV, 1908). Traces of revision have also been seen in the absence from the Folio text of the line censured by Ben Jonson, "Caesar did never wrong but with just cause"; the fullest recent discussion is that of Dover Wilson (*Shakespeare Survey*, 2, 1949).

One scene in *Antony and Cleopatra* that has come under suspicion of conflating Shakespeare's first and second thoughts is the Monument Scene (IV, XV). The fullest study of this is by B. Jenkin (*Review of English Studies*, XXI, 1945), which Dover Wilson's edition follows, and, in a modified form, M. R. Ridley's new Arden.

The textual problem in *Coriolanus* that has attracted most attention is the "frequent mislineations" noted by E. K. Chambers. It has been not very convincingly claimed by G. B. Harrison, *Adams Memorial Studies* (1948), that many of these, as they appear in the Folio, are not errors but correspond to Shakespeare's intentions.

SHAKESPEARE SURVEY

There has been little disagreement on the approximate dating of these plays. *Julius Caesar* is firmly dated autumn 1599. The other two plays are less certainly dated, but most would agree with Chambers in placing *Antony and Cleopatra* about 1606–7 and *Coriolanus* 1607–8. Claims, first made by R. H. Case in his Arden edition (1906) and elaborated by Joan Rees, *Shakespeare Survey*, 3 (1953), that Samuel Daniel's 1607 revision of his *Cleopatra* shows the influence of *Antony and Cleopatra* are rejected by J. Schütze (*Englische Studien*, LXXI, 1936–7), and by E. Schanzer in a forthcoming number of *Review of English Studies*, who holds that, on the contrary, Shakespeare had read Daniel's earlier version and also "skimmed through the added material in the revised form".

SOURCES AND ANALOGUES

The nature of Shakespeare's indebtedness to Plutarch had already been extensively studied before 1900, and more recent study has not greatly modified the picture. Two more collections of the four relevant lives have been published, a very serviceable one, edited by R. H. Carr (1906), of the 1595 text, and Tucker Brooke's more elaborate edition in two volumes (1909) of the 1579 text. There is a comprehensive study dealing with Plutarch, M. H. Shackford's *Plutarch in Renaissance England with Special Reference to Shakespeare* (1929). J. Middleton Murry's essay on North's Plutarch in *Countries of the Mind, Second Series* (1931) contains perceptive comments, as does Sir Henry Newbolt's in *The Tide of Time in English Poetry* (1925). Relevant extracts from a possible subsidiary source, the 1578 translation of Appian's *Civil Wars*, have been edited by E. Schanzer under the title, *Shakespeare's Appian* (1956) with a discussion of the influence of Appian especially on the Antony of *Julius Caesar*. The earliest discussion in the century of Shakespeare's use of Plutarch was R. Büttner's (*Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, XLI, 1905), which was the first to note his debt to the 'Comparison of Alcibiades with Coriolanus'.

M. W. MacCallum's *Shakespeare's Roman Plays* (1910) contains lengthy discussions of his relationship to Plutarch, and of earlier Caesar plays. In the same year, H. M. Ayres (*PMLA*, xxv) dealt with 'Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* in the Light of Some Other Versions'. This study, without claiming for Shakespeare any knowledge of earlier dramatic versions, sets his Caesar in the context of the bombastic heroes of Muret, Grévin and Garnier. Ayres was also the first to discuss in any detail the anonymous *Tragedy of Caesar and Pompey, or Caesar's Revenge*, privately acted by the students of Trinity College, Oxford, registered in 1606, and sometimes, on rather slight evidence, dated 1592–6. This play was more fully described by T. M. Parrott in *Modern Language Review*, v (1910), and published by the Malone Society in 1911. This edition provoked a Münster dissertation by W. Mühlfeld (1912), and an article by H. M. Ayres (*PMLA*, xxx, 1915), and there is an account of the play in F. S. Boas's *University Drama in the Tudor Age* (1914). Since then interest in this tedious play has understandably lapsed. The only obvious point of contact it has with Shakespeare's, the transformation of the 'evil spirit' of North's Plutarch into Caesar's ghost, is not enough to prove indebtedness in either direction, and recent claims by E. Schanzer (*Notes and Queries*, cxcix, 1954) that *Caesar's Revenge* is second only to Plutarch as a source for Shakespeare would carry little conviction even if it were more certain than it is that the play preceded Shakespeare's and was accessible to him.

Few confident claims have been made for Shakespeare's indebtedness to other Caesar plays. In his 1910 article, Ayres mentioned a few parallels with Pescetti's *Cesare* (1594), regarding them

SHAKESPEARE'S ROMAN PLAYS: 1900-1956

as mere coincidence. G. Sarrazin (*Englische Studien*, XLVI, 1912-13), was more impressed by them, and thought that Shakespeare had come across a translation or adaptation of the play, which is also the subject of A. Boecker's *A Probable Italian Source of Shakespeare's 'Julius Caesar'* (1913). H. B. Charlton sums up the position well when he writes in *The Senecan Tradition in Renaissance Tragedy* (1921), "Pescetti is nearer to Shakespeare than the others [among the Senecan dramatists] simply because he develops more motives within the story than do the others". The only surviving certainly pre-Shakespearian Caesar play in English, Kyd's translation of Garnier's *Cornélie* (1594), has not been much discussed. There is only one substantial study, by Joan Rees (*Modern Language Review*, I, 1955), who thinks that Shakespeare may have seen a challenge in "the unintelligible coexistence of braggart and hero in *Cornelia*", and also that Shakespeare's Brutus may owe some of his "turning away from the particular to the grandiloquent general" to Kyd's.

Among minor sources from which Shakespeare has been thought to take hints in *Julius Caesar* may be mentioned Elyot's *Governour*, different passages of which have been cited by Douglas Bush (*Modern Language Notes*, LII, 1937), and by the present writer (*Notes and Queries*, n.s. III, 1956). Sources for the portents before Caesar's death were discussed by M. H. Shackford (*Modern Language Notes*, XLII, 1926). An unplausibly long list of classical sources for Antony's funeral oration was compiled by E. Staedler, a disintegrationist, in *Neuphilologische Monatsschrift*, x (1939).

On the other two plays, there are still fewer miscellaneous studies to record. Dover Wilson, in his edition of *Antony and Cleopatra* (1950), found it difficult to believe that Shakespeare had not read the Countess of Pembroke's *Antonius*, and his arguments are strengthened by E. Schanzer (*Notes and Queries*, n.s. III, 1956). Ethel Seaton's '*Antony and Cleopatra* and the Book of Revelation' (*Review of English Studies*, XXII, 1946) illuminates Shakespeare's creative use of thematically apt material; and P. D. Westbrook (*PMLA*, LXII, 1947) claims Horace's *Odes*, I, xxxvii as a source for the emphasis on Cleopatra's dying pride and the predominance of her determination not to grace Caesar's triumph.

It seems unlikely that discoveries of major importance about Shakespeare's sources in these plays remain to be made. But after a period of quiescence, during which, however, R. W. Chambers, *Shakespeare's Hand in 'Sir Thomas More'* (1923), published some valuable incidental remarks on the adaptation of Plutarch in *Coriolanus*, a more critical study of the use made by Shakespeare of his sources has begun. An early example is H. Heuer's '*Shakespeare und Plutarch: Studien zu Wertwelt und Lebensgefühl im Coriolanus*' (*Anglia*, LXII, 1938), whose subtitle indicates the intention of linking source-study with deeper critical problems. Another article which makes the discussion of Shakespeare's use of his sources ancillary to the study of his art is Maria Wickert's '*Antikes Gedankengut in Shakespeares Julius Caesar*' (*Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, LXXXII-III, 1946-7), particularly valuable on the "spirit of Caesar" and Shakespeare's recreation of the classical notion of a "daimon" or "genius", and also on the rhetorical background of the speeches of Brutus and Antony. The latter topic had also engaged R. W. Zandvoort in '*Brutus's Forum Speech in Julius Caesar*' (*Review of English Studies*, XVI, 1940; reprinted in his *Collected Papers*, 1954). The recent comprehensive study by V. K. Whitaker, *Shakespeare's Use of Learning* (1953), also lays stress on the word 'use', and may serve as a bridge to more general studies of Shakespeare's reading, especially in the classics, such as T. W. Baldwin's monumental *William*

SHAKESPEARE SURVEY

Shakspere's Small Latine and Lesse Greeke (1944), J. A. K. Thomson's *Shakespeare and the Classics* (1952), and, on a smaller scale, F. S. Boas's 'Aspects of Classical Legend and History in Shakespeare' (*Proceedings of the British Academy*, xxix, 1944) and E. Wolff's 'Shakespeare und die Antike' (*Die Antike*, xx, 1944; expanded in *Antike und Abendland*, I, 1945). A comprehensive study of Shakespeare's sources by Kenneth Muir is in preparation.

THE BEGINNING OF THE CENTURY

A. C. Bradley, as has been noted, did not deal with any of the Roman plays in his *Shakespearean Tragedy*. But he did not ignore them, and his essays on *Antony and Cleopatra* (dated 1905 and printed in *Oxford Lectures on Poetry*, 1909) and *Coriolanus* (*Proceedings of the British Academy*, v, 1911-12; reprinted in *A Miscellany*, 1929) gain something from being briefer and less imbedded in philosophizing than his studies of the four 'great tragedies'. The essay on *Antony and Cleopatra* in particular gives reasons for regarding it as inferior to the earlier tragedies that still deserve careful consideration.

There are not many other critical essays of value from the early years of the century, though R. H. Case's introduction to the Arden *Antony and Cleopatra* (1906)—like his later one to *Coriolanus* (1922)—is characteristic of a sound and perceptive scholar. E. K. Chambers' introductions to all three plays, later collected in *Shakespeare: a Survey* (1925), also belong to this period. In a careful study of the views of earlier German scholars, W. Münch, *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, XLII (1906), dealt with the contrast between Aufidius and Coriolanus, finding the former less crudely handled than some critics had maintained. The most solid work, covering all aspects of the plays, was M. W. MacCallum's *Shakespeare's Roman Plays and their Background* (1910), which can still be read with respect and, more often than not, with assent, though scarcely with exhilaration. The equipment of a Roman historian who was also a sane and sensitive critic was brought to bear by W. Warde Fowler on 'The Tragic Element in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*' (*Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature*, xxix, 1911; reprinted in *Roman Essays and Interpretations*, 1920)—an essay of which Bradley wrote, "I am sure nothing so good has been printed on this play" (quoted in R. H. Coon, *William Warde Fowler: an Oxford Humanist*, 1934, p. 178).

FROM BRADLEY TO GRANVILLE-BARKER

The following years were not rich in criticism of these plays. The best-known trend in the Shakespeare criticism of this period was that variously known as 'realist', 'historical' and 'sceptical', and perhaps most conveniently described simply as that of Stoll and Schücking. L. L. Schücking's *Die Charakterprobleme bei Shakespeare* (1919; English translation 1922) dealt at some length with *Julius Caesar* and *Antony and Cleopatra*. The account of the characterization of Caesar is sound in so far as it insists (principally against Brandes) that the greatness of Caesar is pre-supposed throughout, but unduly rigid in dismissing all that has seemed self-dramatizing and bombastic in Caesar's language as simply a case of the primitive dramatic technique of direct self-revelation. Schücking's woodenness of mind comes out still more strongly in his account of Cleopatra, who is, for him, a different woman in the first three acts from what she is in the last two. Cleopatra is also the subject of E. E. Stoll's only extended treatment of any of the

SHAKESPEARE'S ROMAN PLAYS: 1900-1956

Roman plays (*Modern Language Review*, xxiii, 1928; reprinted in *Poets and Playwrights*, 1930), in an essay which well illustrates that the customary collocation with Schücking needs to be made with reservations. For Stoll, the separate characterizations Schücking gives of his two Cleopatras are, each of them, still too psychological, and his own solution is an imaginative unity conveyed through speech. This essay is not an extreme example of Stoll's methods, and indeed, in its broad outline it presents a generally accepted view, though rather lacking in finesse.

The best briefer essays of this period are on *Coriolanus*. J. Middleton Murry's 'A Neglected Heroine of Shakespeare' (*Countries of the Mind*, 1922), together with some questionable reassignment of speeches, gives a sensitive appreciation of Virgilia, and incidentally of the "quality of Roman relentlessness and inevitability" which he has more space to discuss, along with other aspects of the play, in a more general essay in *Discoveries* (1923). There is a useful study of 'The Structure of *Coriolanus*' by A. H. Tolman in *Modern Language Notes*, xxxvii (1922), which is relevant also to Shakespeare's use of Plutarch. This essay is reprinted in *Falstaff and Other Shakespearean Topics* (1925), a book which also contains some miscellaneous comments on various aspects of *Julius Caesar*.

THE LAST THIRTY YEARS

In 1927, the first series of Granville-Barker's *Prefaces to Shakespeare* was published, containing that to *Julius Caesar*. (Those on *Antony and Cleopatra* and on *Coriolanus* followed in 1930 and in 1947). G. Wilson Knight was soon to publish *The Wheel of Fire* (1930; revised edition 1949) and *The Imperial Theme* (1931; revised edition 1951). Much subsequent criticism can be associated with one or the other of these two critics, though some recent work has, rightly and naturally, adopted eclectic methods. Granville-Barker had given a first sample of his treatment of Shakespeare in 'From *Henry V* to *Hamlet*' (*Proceedings of the British Academy*, xi, 1924-5), in which *Julius Caesar* was described as "the turning-point of Shakespeare's career", and *Antony and Cleopatra* as "in some ways the most perfect, and altogether, I think, the most finely spacious piece of play-making he ever did".

The *Julius Caesar* Preface, though it does justice to the play's structural qualities, is one of Granville-Barker's less remarkable pieces. *Antony and Cleopatra* afforded more scope for his emphasis, against anachronistic criticism, on the theatrical virtues of the play as originally staged. It is noteworthy that he here postpones analysis of the characters until he has dealt with questions of construction, staging and verse, whereas in the earlier Preface the characters had been given pride of place, with Brutus at their head. Finally the *Coriolanus* Preface, the last that he lived to complete, suffers somewhat from expansion to book-length, though it is much shorter than the *Hamlet* or the *Othello*. The action of the play is followed and commented on in unnecessary detail, and there is little in the volume, conscientious as it is, that remains vividly in the mind.

G. Wilson Knight has also dealt with all three plays. His first book, *The Wheel of Fire*, contains an essay on 'Brutus and Macbeth' which brings out resemblances that earlier critics had not sufficiently stressed; and more than half of *The Imperial Theme* is devoted to the Roman plays. There is ample (perhaps too ample) documentation of the language and imagery of *Julius Caesar* as "a play of love and fire", and the essay entitled 'The Eroticism of *Julius Caesar*' gives a salutary challenge to assumptions about the relations of the characters, and the poetic impact they make on us. The very lengthy treatment of *Antony and Cleopatra* is less satisfying and the

SHAKESPEARE SURVEY

piling up of detail makes it difficult to get a clear impression. The much briefer essay on *Coriolanus*, on the other hand, shows Knight at his best, bringing out the predominating style of the play, and its congruence with the character of the hero.

About the same time Caroline Spurgeon published her *Shakespeare's Imagery and what it tells us* (1935), whose treatment of the principal tragedies follows closely her earlier 'Leading Motives in the Imagery of Shakespeare's Tragedies' (*Shakespeare Association Pamphlet* 15, 1930). This discusses the pervading 'world' imagery in *Antony and Cleopatra*, and deals rather unsympathetically with *Coriolanus*, which she finds "somewhat languid and artificial". A substantial study of a single play, indebted to Wilson Knight, is R. Binder's *Der Dramatische Rhythmus in Shakespeares 'Antonius und Cleopatra'* (1939).

A number of other books in this period have dealt at length with these plays. The most thorough study of them in relation to the political conceptions of Shakespeare's time is J. E. Phillips' *The State in Shakespeare's Greek and Roman Plays* (1940), which, like other works of this kind, probably exaggerates the importance of Shakespeare's attachment to the commonplaces of political orthodoxy. A salutary contrast is John Palmer's refreshingly unprofessional, and rather old-fashioned, *Political Characters of Shakespeare* (1945), including essays on Brutus and Coriolanus, which demonstrate what can still be done, with little technical equipment, by a critic who knows the world of politics and the text of Shakespeare. These plays figure also in Brents Stirling's *The Populace in Shakespeare* (1949), and *Julius Caesar* in H. B. Charlton's *Shakespearian Tragedy* (1948), which treats it as a history rather than a tragedy in the full sense. The most substantial work dealing with *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Coriolanus* is Willard Farnham's *Shakespeare's Tragic Frontier* (1950), which argues that the later tragedies are distinguished from the earlier by having "deeply flawed" heroes whose nobility "seems inseparable from their flaws". Some of Farnham's views are ably challenged by R. Roth (*Modern Philology*, XLIX, 1950-1).

Briefer studies are J. W. Draper's 'Political Themes in Shakespeare's Later Plays' (*Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, xxv, 1936), which sees an increasing concern for classical local colour in *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Coriolanus*, and P. A. Jorgensen's 'Shakespeare's Coriolanus: an Elizabethan Soldier' (*PMLA*, LXIV, 1949), indicating Coriolanus's deficiency in generalship, as well as his unsuitability for civil life, in the light of contemporary experience, and 'Enobarbus' Broken Heart and the Estate of English Fugitives' (*Philological Quarterly*, xxx, 1951). A recent essay in the same tradition is L. Borinski's "'Soldat" und "Politiker" bei Shakespeare und seinen Zeitgenossen' (*Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, xci, 1955). The most distinguished recent essay dealing with more than one of the plays is perhaps L. C. Knights' 'Shakespeare and Political Wisdom: a Note on the Personalism of *Julius Caesar* and *Coriolanus*' (*Sewanee Review*, LXI, 1953; reprinted in *Some Shakespearean Themes*, 1957), which shows how the plays "refresh our sense of the actual where today it is most urgently needed". Also of value for two of the plays is J. I. M. Stewart's *Character and Motive in Shakespeare* (1949). Few have written as penetratingly on the two Caesars in *Julius Caesar*—the public figure, and the man "opposing to the first falterings of the mind an increasingly rigid and absolute assertion of the Caesar idea", and the chapter on Cleopatra argues with wit and cogency against Schücking's primitivistic notions of Shakespeare's art. Roy Walker in 'The Northern Star: An Essay on the Roman Plays' (*Shakespeare Quarterly*, II, 1951), discusses questions of imagery. Huntington Brown's 'Enter the