

THE TEMPEST

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649534661

The Tempest by William Shakespeare & J. Surtees Phillipotts

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE & J. SURTEES PHILLPOTTS

THE TEMPEST

THE TEMPEST

OF

SHAKESPEARE

EDITED BY

J. SURTEES PHILLPOTTS

HEAD MASTER OF BEDFORD SCHOOL, AND FORMERLY FELLOW
OF NEW COLLEGE, OXFORD

RIVINGTONS
WATERLOO PLACE, LONDON
Oxford, and Cambridge

1876

In 1609, an Eng. ship was
wrecked on Bermudas

External evid (e.g. ref to
mountain) shows that Fern.
could not have been written
before 1609 if since then
is no earlier edition of
1620 - external evid would
make it a later copy.

In internal evid = 1) metrical
list of late plays have few
rhyming lines many lines with
extra syllable
2) all the lines
of Fern 2) list is of a
calmer atmosphere of
Hamlet.

Speeches: -
 Act II i Gonzalo on Montano
 IV i Prospero's speech
 VI "I dream'd on a
 deeper than a
 plummet ever did
 sound,

VI PREFACE
 Gonzalo in apparent
 apologetic.

THE first draught of this edition was written in 1870,
 and privately published for immediate use. An
 endeavour has now been made to incorporate the more
 recent results of Shakespearian criticism. The book
 would never have reappeared had the Clarendon Press
 edition of the play been as adequate on the æsthetic
 side as it is on the philological; but in all the one hun-
 dred closely-printed pages of preface and notes in that
 edition there is not a word on the plot or the characters.
 Those who are interested in making English literature
 take its proper place in English education have loudly
 expressed their disappointment at this omission. No
 lover of Shakespeare can help feeling grateful to Mr.
 Wright for his invaluable contributions on his own lines
 of study. Few, however, will agree with him in his
 present contention. "Æsthetic notes," he declares, "are
 beside the scope and purpose of these books as vehicles
 of instruction and education," and "have been deliber-
 ately and intentionally omitted, because one main object
 of this edition is to induce those for whom they are
 expressly designed to read and study Shakespeare him-
 self." (*King Lear*, Preface, p. xviii.) An excellent object,
 but a strange way to reach it. The natural way to induce
 young or old to study an author is surely to make the
 study attractive by bringing the more interesting side into

3225
 3225
 3225

99500

prominence. It is a further question whether the more interesting side be not also the more stimulating, and therefore of the higher educational value. "Second-hand opinion," like second-hand information, is no doubt inferior to first-hand; but the knowledge that some opinion as to the bearing of parts on the whole is required, is likely to turn the reader's attention to forming a judgment as he reads. A second-hand opinion on one play may thus lead to a first-hand opinion on another. It is with this object that this edition has appeared; and if it fills a temporary gap, till one of our many competent Shakespeare critics deals with the play, the purpose of the editor will have been fully served.

Mr. C. E. Moberly has most kindly prepared the book for press, and has contributed several notes and many suggestive ideas, and especially an Appendix on the connection of Shakespeare and Montaigne. My thanks are also due to Mr. R. Hill for comparing the text minutely with that of the first folio, and particularly to Mr. Furnivall for kindly looking over the whole and adding several valuable references.

J. SURTEES PHILLPOTTS.

BURFORD,
January, 1876.

INTRODUCTION

DATE.—The evidence by which we may, within a few years, fix the date of the *Tempest* is of two kinds—(1) external, (2) internal. First as to external evidence. From GONZALO'S speech (iv. 1, 150) being obviously borrowed from Montaigne, some have fixed the earlier limit of date as 1604, the year when Florio's translation of Montaigne was published. But GONZALO'S speech, however important as proving Shakespeare's study of Montaigne* at some period of his life, is of very little use in fixing the date. Indeed, as a matter of fact, it seems clear that the earlier limit of date must be 1610, in which year an account was published of the shipwreck, in 1609, of Sir George Somers on the coast of the Bermuda Islands, "which islands were of all nations said and supposed to be enchanted and inhabited with witches and devils, which grew by reason of accustomed thunderstorm and tempest near unto those islands." The fact that it was only the admiral's ship which was wrecked on this occasion, and that he had to make a stay on the island, supposed till then to be enchanted, when coupled with the express mention of the "still-vexed Bermoothes" in the *Tempest*, make it highly probable that at least the framework and name of the play were taken by Shakespeare from this source. No earlier edition of the *Tempest* is known than the folio collection of 1623, in which it

* See Appendix on Montaigne's influence on Shakespeare.

stands first.* The memorandum preserved in the Audit Office of its having been performed before King James at the Whitehall festivities on All Saints' Day (1st Nov.) in 1611, has now been proved to be a forgery. Though this or the previous year seems the most probable date, there is really no trustworthy evidence for fixing on any particular year between 1610 and 1616, when Shakespeare's death took place. But in any case the external evidence makes the *Tempest* one of Shakespeare's latest efforts, made not long ere *his* magic 'staff was broken and buried certain fathoms in the earth' (v. i. 53), and the internal evidence leads to the same conclusion. This internal evidence is of two kinds, touching (1) the matter, including the characters and plot of the play, and (2) the metrical form.

(1.) It is necessary in considering the internal evidence to review as far as we can the experiences gone through by Shakespeare himself, and also to compare our play with those which we believe to have preceded and followed it. The development of Shakespeare's genius cannot be more easily perceived than by reading such a play as the *Two Gentlemen of Verona* immediately after the *Tempest*. Every play presents a knot to be unravelled, and the main difference between them we shall find to be the way in which this knot is unravelled, whether by the accident of circumstances or by the characters developing themselves naturally in appropriate circumstances. Take the *Two Gentlemen of Verona*. Here the knot to be unravelled is the treacherous love of PROTEUS for SILVIA, which separates her from her true love VALENTINE, and PROTEUS himself from his true love JULIA. There is a great deal

* Shakespeare, born at Stratford in Warwickshire, 23rd April, 1564.

Elizabeth reigned 45 years—from 1558 to 1603.

James I. " 22 " " 1603 to 1625.

Shakespeare died on his 53rd birthday, 1616, of a fever "contracted after a meeting with Drayton and Ben Jonson."

of art in the arrangement of the two friends contrasting in character each with the lady he is to love, and even with the servant who accompanies him. But the actual unravelling of the knot is by the mere incident of PROTEUS being discovered by both JULIA and VALENTINE in the act of making love to SILVIA. Shame makes him feel the truth of the words in which JULIA excuses her disguise in man's clothes—

“It is the less blot, modesty finds,
Women to change their shapes, than men their minds.”

This little touch makes PROTEUS in six lines repent of his fault, confess, and say—

“What is in Silvia's face, but I may spy
More fresh in Julia's with a constant eye?”

Contrast this easy shrift with WOLSEY's remorse in *Henry VIII.*—making all allowance for the difference of subject—or with the prolonged humiliation given to the various traitors in the *Tempest*. So in the *Winter's Tale*, the oracle requires that the wrong done by LEONTES' jealousy shall be as far as possible undone before the knot is unravelled; but the opening of the last act shows that the only condition on which the poet will allow LEONTES to escape the penalty of his wrong action is, that he has “redeemed his fault by saint-like sorrow,” and paid down more penitence than done trespass. So still more strikingly in *Cymbeline*, with the reconciliation of POSTHUMUS and IMOGEN. POSTHUMUS' mistaken suspicion of IMOGEN is cured only when he deserves its cure by showing that want of faith has not touched the constancy of his life. As in the *Winter's Tale*, this note is struck at the outset of the fifth act, where, with the bloody handkerchief in his hand, POSTHUMUS wishes he had been killed instead of IMOGEN, and vows that now he will die for her.

The *Tempest*, with *Cymbeline* and the *Winter's Tale*, form a group succeeding the great tragedies, *Othello*,